

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has restricted the application to one of the following groups of claims, arguing that each are separate and distinct inventions:

1. Claims 1, 42 and 61-70
2. Claims 2-11, 44-47, and 59
3. Claims 12-19 and 43
4. Claims 20-32 and 48-52
5. Claims 33-41 and 53-56
6. Claims 57, 58 and 60.

Applicant traverses the requirement as regards Claims 2-41, 43–47, and 48–56, and 59. These claims have been amended all to depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1. The claims of Groups 2 – 5 are no longer distinct from the claims of Group 1 as it cannot be shown that (1) the combination as claimed in the claims of Group 1 do not require the particulars of the sub-combinations claimed in the claims of Groups 2-5 and (2) that the sub-combinations of the claims of Groups 2-5 have utility by itself or in other combinations. No longer does the combination as claimed lack the particulars of the sub-combination as all of the claims of Groups 2-5 as amended now include all of the limitations of the claims of Group 1. MPEP §806.05(c).

Applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration of this requirement. Applicant elects the claims of group 1 namely Claims 1, 42, and 61-70 to be examined as required under 35 CFR 1.143.

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Lundy, Reg. No. 22,162  
Krieg Devault Lundy LLP  
825 Anthony Wayne Building  
203 E. Berry St.  
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802  
Phone: (260) 422-1534  
Fax: (260) 423-1590